




# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,631	07/28/2003	Fred Monroe	03-748	4899
39310	7590	03/16/2005	EXAMINER	
MBHB/TRADING TECHNOLOGIES			BASHORE, ALAIN L	
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 3200			PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60606			3624	

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

 <b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/628,631	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MONROE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Alain L. Bashore	<b>Art Unit</b> 3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. 1-8, 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory because the method claims as presented do not claim a technological basis. Without a claimed basis, the claims are interpreted as involving no more than a manipulation outside of a technological art and therefore non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In contrast, a method claim that includes in the preamble and body of the claim structural / functional interrelationships that are solely by computer (and non-trivial) are considered to have a technological basis and thus within the technological arts [See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d 1669, 1671 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001) – used only for content and reasoning since not precedential].

Claims which are broad enough to read on statutory subject matter and on nonstatutory subject matter are considered nonstatutory [see *In re Lintner*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1015, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972)].

The term “electronic market” does not explicitly claim how the use of technology is utilized in the claim.

Art Unit: 3624

3. Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory because as an alternative interpretation there is claimed software.

Applicant indicated that "component" is defined in the spec as hardware, software or a combination of both. This means that every recited element of the "apparatus" can now be interpreted as merely software. Software per se however is not statutory subject matter as seen in MPEP 2106 IV B 1 (a).

The software per se must be claimed as part of a hardware or as encoded on a computer readable medium so that functionality is realized. Functionality to be realized, is more than a manipulation of an abstract idea [*In re Wamerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354; 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994)].

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for software or a matching engine to send and receive orders by use of hardware, does not reasonably provide enablement for enabling software per se to provide the function without hardware. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 3624

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17-21 recite "system" which is vague and indefinite since the common meaning of the term does not clearly determine the statutory class of invention. Since the term system may encompass more than one statutory class, there is a requirement for an indication on the record as to what statutory class of invention the "system" claims belong to (see MPEP 2106.IV.B). The statutory provision for this requirement may be found in 35 U.S.C 101 that recites the statutory classes of invention.

For the purposes of this examination these claims are considered apparatus.

Claim 17 recites "component" which is vague and indefinite since it is not clear the meets and bound of the term. Is this a software, hardware, or combination thereof?

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith in view of Nordlicht.

Keith discloses sending an order to an electronic market including sending an order on behalf of a trader (para 0175). The sending is performed when conditions are satisfied, the condition may be in the form of a look-up table (para 0201-0205).

Keith does not explicitly disclose:

automatic modification of order, sending the order or message, all from a first electronic market to a second electronic market; and,

monitoring external data and order modification are both done by the market.

Nordlicht discloses sending the order from a first electronic market to a second electronic market (para 0009-0010) and where the monitoring external data and order modification are both done by the market (para 0013).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include automatic modification of order, sending the order, or a message all from a first electronic market to a second electronic market because Nordlicht teaches conditions present that are required to modify and send orders (para 0012).

Art Unit: 3624

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include the monitoring external data and order modification are both done by the market because Nordlicht teaches that con conditions can be predetermined (para 0013).

### ***Conclusion***


9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 703-308-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (Monday thru Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Alain L. Bashore  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3624